



COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET
MAJORITY CAUCUS
U.S. House of Representatives
106th Congress — Washington, DC



Balanced Budget Democrats??????

'The Facts' Undermine Revisionist Claims

16 August 2000

Recent claims by President Clinton and Congressional Democrats seem to suggest that they are responsible for eliminating the deficit and balancing the budget. Even a cursory look at thoroughly documented historical fact undermines such adventurous and risky claims:

Just the Facts, Ma'am

- < Testifying before the House Budget Committee on February 7, 1995, White House Budget Director Alice M. Rivlin said: "I do not think that adhering to a firm path for balance by 2002 is a sensible thing to do." **She also said: "It is not always good policy to have a balanced budget."** (Hearing document, 104-4, pages 32, 40)
 - < While Republicans took control of Congress in early 1995, having pledged to balance the budget, the Clinton-Gore administration insisted that balancing the budget was not necessary. **In fact, the Clinton-Gore budget introduced on February 6, 1995, called for a deficit this year (FY2000) of \$194 billion.**
 - < The President's policies would have produced deficits of almost \$200 billion a year or more as far as the eye could see, would have **spent Social Security money, and would have increased the publicly held debt to \$4.8 trillion in 2000.**
 - < As 1995 unfolded, Clinton kept throwing up smokescreen budget "plans" that contained little or no detail and failed to get anywhere near balance. **At various times that year, Clinton claimed the budget would be balanced in 5, 9, and 10 years.**
- S "I think [balancing the budget] clearly can be done in less than 10 years."
5/20/95
- S "I will present a five-year plan to balance the budget." 6/8/95
- S "It took decades to run up this deficit; it's going to take a decade to wipe it out."
6/13/95

- < The President's shifting positions in 1995 on balancing the budget caused tremendous consternation among members of his own party:
 - S "I think most of us learned sometime ago that if you don't like the president's position on a particular issue, you simply need to wait a few weeks. **If you can follow this White House on the budget, you are a whole lot smarter than I am.**" Rep. David Obey, D-WI, Associated Press, 6/3/95 (emphasis added)
 - S "They cooked the numbers..." Senator Bob Kerrey, D-NE, *Washington Times*, 6/26/95
 - S "I don't know what's going to happen to the (Clinton) proposal, it doesn't seriously address...the underlying problems that we have right now with our budget." Senator Bob Kerrey, D-NE, Associated Press, 6/14/95
- < By January 1996 – with the Congress having successfully crafted and passed a comprehensive, fully detailed, 7-year balanced budget plan – the administration budget for fiscal year 1997 cast Clinton and Gore as born-again budget balancers.

Despite claims to the contrary, the historical record shows that the Clinton-Gore administration and Congressional Democrats were dragged kicking and screaming toward accepting the American people's demand for a balanced budget and fiscal responsibility in Washington.

Let us not forget, also, the sweeping economic proposals of 1993: Where would the economy be today if President Clinton had gotten his 'stimulus package,' if Al Gore had gotten his BTU tax, and Hillary Rodham Clinton had taken over the nation's entire health care system?